

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/326,402	BLUMENFELD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Channing S Mahatan	1631	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Channing S Mahatan (Examiner).

(3) _____.

 (2) Frank C. Eisenschenk (Applicants' Representative).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 0
Time: 10:30AM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed: _____

Claims discussed: _____

Prior art documents discussed: _____

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Frank C. Eisenschenk authorized the charge of the required fee for extension of time (\$420.00) to Deposit Account No. 19-0065 in order to make an Examiner's amendment which places this application in condition for allowance. The Examiner's amendment to correct the typographical error claim 1 by replacing "SEQ ID NO:1" to "SEQ ID NO: 12" and removing the second recitation of "SEQ ID NO: 12" language in the substitute paragraph beginning at page 5, line 26 was also approved by Frank C. Eisenschenk. An additional Examiner's amendment was required to correct the multiple recitation of "according to the method of claim 133" in claim 135, which was also approved by Frank C. Eisenschenk on 05 February 2004.